



Norman H. Bangerter  
Governor

Dee C. Hansen  
Executive Director

Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.  
Division Director

# State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

355 West North Temple  
3 Triad Center, Suite 350  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203  
801-538-5340

m/035/009

September 17, 1992

To: Minerals File

From: Holland Shepherd, Senior Reclamation Specialist *HW*

Re: Kennecott Meeting to Discuss Changes to the Barney's Canyon Permit

Date of Meeting: September 3, 1992

Time of Meeting: 9:00am to 12:00n

Participants: Dave Hodson, Bill Dodge, Mike Pagel,  
Kennecott; Bob Bayer, JBR; Holland  
Shepherd, Wayne Hedberg, DOGM

This meeting was held to discuss the response comments which Kennecott was preparing for the Division. The comments would be in reply to our initial review of the Barney's Canyon revision. Several major points were discussed. They are outlined below:

1. **Evaluation and identification of sulfitic wastes.** The Division is concerned about the identification and placement of sulfitic wastes which might be encountered on the site. Basically, the operator indicated that this should not be a problem, because the extent of sulfitic wastes would be insignificant. Also, if sulfide material would be encountered, it would be easily identifiable by its color (blackish grey), and could be placed in a manner, on waste dumps, which would prevent the concentration of acid forming material. Kennecott staff explained that the material that is going to be mined is predominantly oxide in nature and that very little is carbonaceous or sulfitic (this includes waste material and ore).

2. **Reclaiming Angle of Repose Dumps.** The operator has indicated that to reclaim the 7200 and 7300 dumps at 2:1 slopes would be a great economic hardship and perhaps unnecessary. The Division has been looking at the possibility of the Bingham Pit operation filling up the Dry Fork Canyon with enough waste material to make it more feasible for the Barney's operation to push out slopes on the 7200 dump to 2:1. Unfortunately, the Bingham operation is not ready to commit to a time frame to accomplish this. It is unknown whether the Bingham operation will push its Dry Fork dumps into this area within the next year, 20 years from now, or never.

We decided that the decision to reclaim at 2:1 would be left until time for final reclamation. At that point the operator and Division could revisit the question of feasibility pushing the slopes out. Also, we discussed using the 7300 dump as a test area for evaluating the revegetation approach discussed in the plan. If this was successful regrading the 7200 would not be necessary.

Because the issue keeps coming up regarding the reclamation of these very steep slopes, Bob Bayer offered to set up a tour for Division staff at the Independence Mining site in Nevada.

The extra cost to regrade the 7200 dump at 2:1 is @ \$1,000,000, according to the operator. If the dump were to be regraded at the end of mine life for Barney's, there is always the possibility of covering a portion of it up, if the Bingham operation ever decided to expand into Dry Fork.

3. **Haul Road Reclamation.** The Division is concerned about the adequacy of haul road reclamation discussed in the plan. The plan does not call for complete regrading of the haul road and is vague on the specifics of the reclamation of the cut and fill slopes associated with the road. We discussed installing language into the revision which would more specifically address reclamation of the disturbance associated with the haul road. This language would include an explanation of reclamation techniques to be used on cut and fill slopes.

The operator would need to apply for a variance on the roads, for areas which would be left at steep angles and where topsoil was to be left off.

4. **Steep Slope Revegetation Standard.** It was agreed that page

Kennecott and the Division would work jointly on a revegetation standard for the areas of the site which have steep slopes (>2:1) and no topsoil. Both operator and Division staff will also evaluate various best available technology and economically viable options for these areas. The idea was presented, at the meeting, that the present proposal may not be adequate to achieve and acceptable plant cover on these areas. Other options might include reapplication of hydromulch and seed, utilization of improved seedmix, etc.